

port. The pull central office also includes a switch controller in communication with the switch, the switch connecting the switch controller to the calling signal. The switch controller obtains a called party identifier from the calling party. The switch controller creates a call request signal that includes the switching information and the called party identifier. The switch controller causes a switch transmitter to transmit the call request signal to the called party, and when the called party responds with a call acceptance signal at a second port, connects the second port to the first port, thereby completing the call. See Abstract.

As is evident from the above description and the cited sections of Fath in the Final Office Action, Fath describes how the pull central office can be used to route the call of two roamers in the region of the pull central office. Fath's FIG. 8 and the supporting text describes how two callers who are normally in one network are roaming in a second network and the call is routed between them through a pull central office in the roaming network without having to query the home network. The cited sections of Fath only imply that the call is routed to the pull central office that is associated with the called party. Fath does not specify that this pull central office is associated with the calling party or the called party. The claims are explicit and specify that the gateway is associated with the calling party. Moreover, the claims are explicit that the call is routed directly to the called party without the use of the second gateway. This is contrary to what is implied by Fath. At best, Fath requires that the call be routed through a gateway in the second network that is avoided by the claims.

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that the admitted prior art, Creamer and Fath do not disclose the determining the gateway in the first network that directly routes bearer traffic from a gateway in the first network that is proximate to the calling party to a called party in a second network that is proximate to the called party. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the cited combination of the admitted prior art, Creamer and Fath does not disclose, teach or suggest the limitations as required by independent claims 1 and 9. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 9 are patentable over the cited combination. As claims 2-8 depend on claim 1 and claims 10-17 depend on claim 9, Applicants submit that these dependent claims are

Serial No. 10/779,893
Xenakis et al.
Case No. CE10902W

patentable for the same reasons. Applicants request that the rejection under Section 103(a) be withdrawn.

As Applicants have overcome all substantive rejections and objections given by the Examiner and have complied with all requests properly presented by the Examiner, Applicants contend that this Amendment, with the above discussion, overcomes the Examiner's objections to and rejections of the pending claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of the application. If the Examiner is of the opinion that any issues regarding the status of the claims remain after this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative to expedite resolution of the matter.

Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to **50-2117**.

Respectfully submitted,
Xenakis, George, et al.

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
Law Department

Customer Number: **22917**

By: /Simon B. Anolick/

Simon B. Anolick
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 37,585
Telephone: 847-576-4234
Fax: 847-576-3750